

REMARKS

This paper incorporates by reference the arguments presented in the Response paper filed November 9, 2010.

Independent claim 47 has been further amended to distinguish over the prior art of record. In particular, the transaction code is now defined as being “configured such that it is capable” of being output from the wireless communication device and optically scanned. In this regard, the Examiner is reminded of Mr. Mamdani’s Declaration that has been of record in the case since February 13, 2009. Mr. Mamdani’s Declaration explains why 2D bar code (such as described in Melick) would not have been used to facilitate complex wireless transactions at the time of the invention here. The amendment here further emphasizes the point that prior art codes were not readable from wireless communication devices, and the new claim language here further clarifies that the claimed “transaction code” is “configured such that” it is capable of being optically scanned in the desired manner.

In addition, the claim further states that the optical scanning that takes place “at the second time” is conditioned upon a determination at that time that the user of the wireless communication device is authorized to use the transaction code transmitted to the device to facilitate the wireless transaction. This determination provides an additional degree of security at the first point at which the code is to be scanned. Support for this amendment is found, among other places, at page 2, lines 7-14, page 5, lines 1-7, and page 7, lines 3-15. No new matter has been included.

A Notice of Allowance is requested for the reasons previously advanced.

If any additional fees are due, please charge Deposit Account 50-4001 in the undersigned’s name.

Respectfully submitted,

/David H. Judson/

By:

David H. Judson, Reg. No. 30,467

November 29, 2010

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT